

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/776,714
Reply to Office Action dated October 31, 2005

Remarks

In the subject Action, the Examiner rejected claims 9-14. Applicant has amended claims 9-11. Applicant has canceled claims 12-13 without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 9-11 and 14 remain pending in the present application. In light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the pending rejections and advancement of this application to allowance.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 9 as being anticipated by Nakagomi et al. under §102(b). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection in view of the amendments to claim 9 above and the arguments below.

Claim 9 recites a probe pad on a semiconductor circuit having a mark-shape contour to indicate the relative location of the probe pad on the semiconductor circuit. In contrast, Nakagomi et al. fails to suggest or disclose a probe pad having a mark-shape contour to indicate the relative location of the probe pad on the semiconductor circuit. Rather, Nakagomi et al. discloses a bank of many probes 32 provided on the under surface of the probe board 25, and the bank of these probes 32 is arrayed in a manner to correspond to a bank of the electrode pods on the substrate 2. See, e.g., col. 6, ll. 50-65; Figs. 7-8. It is clear that the probe 32 is for testing the electrode pods on the substrate 2, which is distinct from the probe pad of claim 9 in the present application.

Furthermore, the alignment pins 33 in Nakagomi et al. are not the same as the mark-shape contour in claim 9. The mark-shape contour in claim 9 is a limitation of the probe pad. However, the alignment pins 33 in Nakagomi et al. are a further element beyond the probes 32. It is thus submitted, for at least the reasons noted, that claim 9 is patentable.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/776,714
Reply to Office Action dated October 31, 2005

The Office Action further includes comments regarding claim 9 corresponding to Iino et al. and Takeuchi et al., but does not include a formal rejection of claim 9 based on Iino et al. and Takeuchi et al. or set forth any reason why the Examiner believes that these references anticipate claim 9. Because a formal rejection and a fully and clearly stated reason for a rejection are required (see MPEP 707.07(d)), Applicant respectfully submits that claim 9 has not been properly rejected based on Iino et al. and Takeuchi et al.

In view of the above, Applicant requests the Examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Next in the subject Action, the Examiner rejected claims 10-14 under §103(a) as being obvious over Nakagomi et al. Applicant traverses this rejection.

As discussed above, independent claim 9 is patentable. Thus, dependent claims 10, 11, and 14 are also believed to be allowable over the art of record. Applicant does not otherwise concede the correctness of the Examiner's rejection and reserves the right to make additional arguments as may be necessary. Applicant has canceled claims 12 and 13 (Applicant does not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection). In view of the cancellation, the rejection of claims 12 and 13 is now moot.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending rejection.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/776,714
Reply to Office Action dated October 31, 2005

Conclusion


This response is believed to be responsive to all points raised in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the currently pending claims. Should the Examiner have any remaining questions or concerns, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney at 612.336.4611 to discuss the same.

Respectfully submitted,



MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Dated: Jan 30, 2006

By 
Tong Wu
Reg. No. 43,361

BHB:TW:SZ:km